



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/689,501	10/17/2003	Branislav Mcandzija	15685P210D2	4261
45222	7590	10/15/2007	EXAMINER	
ARRAYCOMM/BLAKELY 1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-4040			TAYLOR, NICHOLAS R	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2141				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/15/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/689,501	MEANDZIJA ET AL.
	Examiner Nicholas R. Taylor	Art Unit 2141

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 August 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 17 October 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-17 have been examined and are rejected.
2. The proposed amendments to the specification filed on August 1st, 2007, are approved.

### ***Claim Objections***

3. The claims are object to for the following minor informality:  
Claim 7 repeats "the."

### ***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments filed August 1st, 2007, with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:  
The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
6. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, claim 8 compares the validity period of a session certificate to itself.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

8. Claims 1-4, 6-11, and 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by Hur (U.S. Patent 7,181,620).

9. As per claims 1, 10, and 13, Hur teaches a method comprising:

receiving a subscription request at an Internet Service Provider (ISP) from a user terminal capable of accessing the ISP using the wireless access network; (Hur, col. 8, lines 47-54; see ISP discussion of col. 9, lines 4-32 and col. 10, lines 8-31; see also network architecture of col. 11, lines 23-35 and col. 19, lines 3-41)

assigning a subscription identifier to the user terminal at the ISP in response to the subscription request; receiving a service certificate signed by a certificate authority, the service certificate including the subscription identifier; (Hur, col. 10, line 57 to col. 11, line 6; see certificate authority signing of col. 11, lines 37-48)

checking the service certificate against a certificate revocation list (CRL) maintained by the ISP; and (Hur, col. 11, line 60 to col. 12, line 40 and col. 12, line 54 to

col. 13, line 7, where the equivalent service certificate is checked to ensure that it should be granted)

providing, to the user terminal, if the service certificate is valid, a session certificate to be used to access the wireless access network, the session certificate having a shorter validity period than the service certificate (Hur, col. 10, lines 33-55).

10. As per claims 2 and 14, Hur teaches the system further wherein receiving the service certificate comprises receiving the service certificate from an access point being used by a user terminal to access the wireless access network (Hur, col. 8, lines 47-54; see ISP discussion of col. 9, lines 4-32 and col. 10, lines 8-31; see also network architecture of col. 11, lines 23-35 and col. 19, lines 3-41).

11. As per claims 3 and 15, Hur teaches the system further wherein determining whether the service certificate is valid comprises searching a certificate revocation list at the ISP (Hur, col. 11, line 60 to col. 12, line 40 and col. 12, line 54 to col. 13, line 7, where the equivalent service certificate is checked to ensure that it should be granted).

12. As per claims 4, 11, and 16, Hur teaches the system further wherein the one or more session certificates are each associated with a link-level session available to the user terminal (Hur, e.g., col. 12, lines 13-40 and figs. 5A, 5B, and 6).

13. As per claim 6, Hur teaches a method comprising:

receiving a digital certificate at a wireless access point of a wireless access network from a user terminal seeking access to the wireless access network, the digital certificate to be used to authenticate the user terminal; (Hur, col. 8, lines 47-54; see ISP discussion of col. 9, lines 4-32 and col. 10, lines 8-31; see also network architecture of col. 11, lines 23-35 and col. 19, lines 3-41)

determining a type of the digital certificate; if the certificate is a session certificate, then determining the validity of the digital certificate by searching a certificate revocation list (CRL) at the wireless access point that is associated with session certificates; and (Hur, col. 14, lines 2-65, where the digital certificate is validated against revocation)

if the certificate is a service certificate, then sending the certificate to an Internet Service Provider to determine the validity of the certificate (Hur, e.g., col. 14, lines 1-36 and col. 10, lines 8-31).

14. As per claim 7, Hur teaches the system further wherein determining the type of the digital certificate comprises determining the length of the digital certificate (Hur, e.g., see certificate length of col. 10, lines 16-55).

15. As per claim 8, Hur teaches the system further wherein the validity periods of session certificates is shorter than the validity periods of session certificates (Hur, e.g., see certificate length of col. 10, lines 16-55).

16. As per claim 9, Hur teaches the system further wherein the CRL associated with session certificates is shorter than the CRL associated with service certificates (Hur, e.g., see certificate length of col. 10, lines 16-55).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

17. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

18. Claims 5, 12, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hur (U.S. Patent 7,181,620) and "RFC 1661: The Point-to-Point Protocol (PPP)."

19. As per claims 5, 12, and 17, Hur teaches the above, yet fails to explicitly teach wherein each link-level session comprises a PPP session.

RFC 1661 teaches the use of the Point-to-Point Protocol for establishing link level networking connections (RFC 1661, abstract and Introduction section 1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have combined Hur and RFC 1661 to provide the point to point protocol encapsulation of RFC 1661 in the system of Hur, because doing so would enable additional connection configurations that would benefit the type and quantity of devices that are connectable to the network as contemplated by a variety of connection methods (see e.g., Hur, col. 19, lines 3-41).

***Conclusion***

20. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new grounds of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas Taylor whose telephone number is (571) 272-3889. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:00am to 5:30pm, with alternating Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on (571) 272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

NT 10-5-07

Nicholas Taylor  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2141



JASON CARDONE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER